



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

attention to some confusion in the account of the printing of the various volumes of *Amelia*.<sup>2</sup> The proof-reading is almost perfect;<sup>3</sup> the illustrations well-chosen and exquisitely reproduced; the extensive bibliography itself a testimony to the greatness of Fielding's fame.

And yet how will this truly great work be received? With quiet satisfaction by scholars, doubtless; but, since it rescues and does not ruin a reputation, with little general comment and no excitement. I am sure that such a reception will satisfy Professor Cross. He is the last to seek notoriety such as has been won recently by the brilliantly perverse author of *Eminent Victorians*. It is better to work quietly towards the refurbishing of an unjustly tarnished fame than to damn reputations in epigram.

SAMUEL C. CHEW.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

---

*The Place-Names of Cumberland and Westmorland.* By W. J. SEDGEFIELD. Manchester, England, 1915. Pp. xlv, 208. [Publications of the University of Manchester. English Series, No. VII.]

The counties of Cumberland and Westmorland in northwestern England correspond roughly to the ancient Cumbria. It is a region where the three national elements, Angles, Norsemen, and Celt, came in closer contact than perhaps anywhere else in England. And as elsewhere, so here, it was evidently only the English and the Norse that mixed and fused and left numerous evidences of that fusion, whereas the Celt disappeared, leaving but few traces behind. Before the seventh century Cumbria must have been almost purely Celtic; through the seventh and the ninth centuries Angles came and settled, but what proportion of the population the two races made up in the eighth century we cannot tell. In the last quarter of the ninth century Danish visits are recorded; from about 900 the permanent Norse settlements begin. In 945 King

<sup>2</sup> See vol. II, p. 304, and cf. p. 308.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. I, p. 113, second note: For "Cook" read "Cooke"; vol. II, p. 325, middle of page: For "Goss" read "Gosse." Let these two corrections be considered evidence of the delight with which the reviewer has read the book, including notes and bibliography.

Eadmund of the West-Saxons devastated and conquered Cumbria and gave it to Malcolm II of Scotland to govern as a fief of the English crown. However, Malcolm's rule was evidently only nominal, for about the middle of the century the Norse were the actual rulers.<sup>1</sup> They had ceased to come as marauders and had for some time come as peaceful settlers. And for perhaps 150 years they continued to come as peaceful settlers. And the settlement of the English, which was begun earlier, also continued and grew. By the close of the eleventh century we can assume the Anglo-Norse settlement was complete, and the fusion of Angles and Norsemen well under way; the racial and linguistic foundations of the modern counties of Cumberland and Westmorland had been definitely and finally laid. The incorporation of the region into the Kingdom of England was accomplished in 1091 when Cumbria became a part of the Kingdom of England and William Rufus drove its ruler Dolfin<sup>2</sup> out of the town of Carlisle, although he did not take actual possession until 1092.<sup>3</sup> A few years later the two counties of Cumberland and Westmorland were formed about as at present by the division of the old Kingdom of Cumbria. And of the Celt? The evidence of the dialects and the place-names alike would seem to show that as the Norsemen came in in steadily larger numbers and as the English gained the ascendancy the Celt for the most part went elsewhere. Carlisle, Derwent, and Penrith are among the few Kymric names.

In the Introduction the author of the present investigation deals briefly with the historical background of the problem, the conditions under which the mixed language arose, the character of the place-names, the Anglo-Saxon and the Scandinavian element, the distribution of the several endings, the words represented in the names, and finally the personal names entering into the place-names. There is a good bibliography, and a helpful index, but a very short phonology, the whole vast material being dealt with very inadequately, of course, in the page and a half given to it. This omission I must regard as a defect, for the reader should have put before him the phonological laws by which the author establishes the equivalence set up between the place-name and the

<sup>1</sup> Sedgefield, Introduction, p. xi.

<sup>2</sup> Dolfin = ON. *Dólgfinnr*.

<sup>3</sup> J. E. Marr, *Cumberland*, 1910, p. 2.

elements that are offered as their source. In spite of this, however, the investigation is a valuable one, and will occupy a worthy place by the side of the many contributions to the study of English place-names that have appeared in recent years.<sup>4</sup> I shall not go into the etymologies as a whole, but I would like briefly to consider certain points, touching mainly method and criteria of loan.

While it is a rather simple matter to eliminate the few Celtic names, the problem of the provenance of the Anglo-Northern names is a tremendously complicated one. One starts out with the difficulty of the similarity of Old English and Old Scandinavian as regards form of the words involved; they are very often nearly alike, and they are often identical in form. As examples of the first kind I may give: OE. *æsc*, ON. *askr*; OE. *dæl*, ON. *dalr*; OE. *fleet*, ON. *fljót*; OE. *stede*, ON. *staðr*. Examples of the second kind: OE. *clif*, ON. *klif*; OE. *hlið*, ON. *hlið*; OE. *hus*, ON. *hus*; OE. *land*, ON. *land*; OE. *sand*, ON. *sandr*; OE. *tun*, ON. *tun*. The author well illustrates this himself in the table on p. xvi. However, the table takes into account only the classical West-Saxon forms, and I fail to find elsewhere in the Introduction or in the etymological discussions any formulation of those significant characteristics of Northern Late Old English which must be taken into account when considering certain groups of words. He does indeed discuss in the Introduction a hypothetical English-Norse language of the eleventh and twelfth centuries in which period many of the names originated. But this consideration touches only the problems of vocabulary, inflexions, and the leveling of endings, not the pronunciation. For instance, the author would seem to relate all cases of words in *-a-*, *-ai-*, or *-ay-* (pronounced *ē*) to the ON. words in *-ei-* (*æi*), and not to the OE. word in *ā*; among such words are: *ain*, *aik*, *braid* or *braith*, *stane* or *stain*. But all such forms may as well be from OE. as from ON.,

<sup>4</sup> Of these the most recent ones are: H. Lindkvist, *Middle English Place-names of Scandinavian Origin*, Upsala, 1912; W. H. Duignan, *Worcestershire Place-Names*, Oxford, 1912; H. Alexander, *The Place-Names of Oxfordshire*, Oxford, 1912; A. Goodall, *Place-Names of Southwest Yorkshire*, Cambridge, 1913; J. A. Sephton, *A Handbook of Lancashire Place-Names*, Liverpool, 1913; H. Mutschmann, *The Place-Names of Nottinghamshire*, Cambridge, 1913; W. St. C. Baddely, *Place-Names of Gloucestershire*, Gloucester, 1913; B. Walker, *The Place-Names of Derbyshire*, Derby, 1914-1915; R. G. Roberts, *The Place-Names of Sussex*, Cambridge, 1914.

when names of Northwestern England are considered. This whole question has, of course, been discussed elsewhere, and I need not go into it again.<sup>5</sup> But I call attention to it because this important feature of Northern Old English affects a considerable number of the names here under consideration. I may note one small group: the names *Aikhead*, near Wigton, *Aikshaw*, sw. of Abbey Town, *Aikton*, n. of Wigton, and *Aiketgate*, near Armathwaite. Were these places settled by Angles or Norsemen? Unless we have conclusive old records there must always be some uncertainty about this class of names. From the material at hand we should have to say that *Aikshaw* is English, for *-shaw* certainly is; hence the OE. source would be *ācsceaga*. *Aiketgate* seems to be Norse, for both the first and the last component part is Norse; however, the only form offered is the modern one. In the case of *Aikton*, the name seems to be Norse; the forms *Aykton*, 1231, and *Ayketon*, 1237, would seem to favor this, but the spelling *Ecton* in the *Doomesday Book* complicates it. Norse influence upon an originally English name seems not unlikely here. Other cases that are uncertain are: *Ennerdale*, *Braystones*, *Stainburn*, *Stainton* in Cumberland and *Stainmore* in Westmorland (early reference *Stanmoir*, year 980). Perfectly clear, however, is *Annaside*, earlier *Aynerset*, ON. *Einars-sætr*.

Since undoubtedly the proportion of English names was larger (possibly much larger) than the Scandinavian, it is somewhat surprising that Scandinavian words entering into the place-names of the two counties are more than twice as numerous as the English words. The Scandinavians used a greater variety of words in the formation of place-names, while the English were more in the habit of employing well-established 'stock' words. As to the actual proportion of names, the author's lists would seem to show a somewhat larger number to be Scandinavian than English. However, as indicated above, a group of the names that are assigned to the Scandinavian side could as well be English.

It would seem, also, that certain Scandinavian endings became the fashion and were resorted to by both Scandinavians and English. In such cases, then, the ending is no longer a test of the

<sup>5</sup>A summary of the problem may be found in the *Saga-Book of the Viking Club*, London, 1911, article "Norse Elements in English Dialects," pp. 1-18, by George T. Flom.

nationality of the settler. Such an ending is perhaps especially *-by*, which has wider range than other Scandinavian endings and is especially frequent in certain regions; it often passes beyond the boundaries of the Scandinavian settlement as marked out by the general character of the names. In the list of Cumberland names I find the following ending in *-by*,—names of places of apparently English settlers: *Allonby*, *Birkby*, *Botcherby*, *Ellonby*, *Etterby*, *Glassonby*, *Gutterby*, *Motherby* (*Modhere*), *Robberby*, (*Hrod-beorhtby*), *Wiggonby*. Several are Norman in form, as pointed out by the author: <sup>6</sup> *Aglionby*, and *Ponsonby*, while *Flimby*, older *Flemingby*, and *Scotby* are both named after the nationality of the settler. This extension in the use of the ending *-by* also makes doubtful such names as *Asby* (OE. *Aesc* or ON. *Ask*?) and *Crossby*.

English place-names (and personal names) in all parts of England, but especially in the North, suffered many changes by the loss of a consonant in consonant groups, by weakening of endings, etc., in the eleventh to the fourteenth century. While changes of this kind are especially characteristic of regions where two languages meet and become fused, the first one, that of the reduction of consonant groups, may be in a more direct way due to Norse influence. In West-Scandinavian the tendency is for the middle consonant to disappear; the law will be found formulated in Noreen's *Altnordische Grammatik* I, § 281. It would be worth while to examine the extent of such reductions in Northern English names. I shall here merely note that the fact affects the question of the derivation of some of the names. For example, the name *Arkleside* in North Riding, Yorkshire, may contain the ODan. *Arkil* rather than the ON. *Arnketell*, for in North Riding there were a great many more Danes than Norsemen. But the name *Arkleton* in Dumfriesshire, Scotland, is probably rather to be referred to the ON. form (*Arnkl* > *Arkl*). And the name *Arkleby*, near *Aspatia* in Cumberland, is certainly most likely to have been the place of a Norse settler. Contraction of the second element *-ketell* to *-kell* was of course common enough in Norway and Iceland, and does not particularly distinguish Danish from Norse. Such reductions probably nearly all took place on English soil among Danes, Norsemen, and English alike, and some of them are very late, as e. g., *Corby*, which in forms of 1120 and 1167

<sup>6</sup> Pp. 1 and 88.

appears as *Chorkeby* and *Corcheby*, and as *Corckby* as late as 1572. In Westmorland the consonant group *-skb-* has become *-sb-* in *Asby*, but in *Askham* the *k* remains, of course. In Cumberland the name *Ascpatric*, date 1230, shows a form *Aspatric* for the year 1233. Thus the reduced form is that of actual speech already then and the one with *-c-* represents a conservative spelling.

GEORGE T. FLOM.

*University of Illinois.*

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

### *Titus Andronicus* AND SHAKESPEARE DOGMATICS

I wish to record a protest against both the tone and the method of Professor Brooke's paper (*MLN*, xxxiv, 32 ff.), in which he discusses the views of Professor H. D. Gray on the authorship of *Titus Andronicus*. It is one thing to dissent from an argument, disposing of the evidence offered as one best can, and quite another to garble it, as I believe Mr. Brooke (doubtless unintentionally) has done; but to go still further, and cavalierly request the writer from whom one dissents to keep off the field of criticism in which he has been working, because one pleases to consider his work superfluous and has been irked by the necessity of reading it, will be admitted to be unusual.

Mr. Gray is fully competent to defend his own position, and I myself hold no brief for the special thesis of his paper on *Titus Andronicus*; but since the subject is of no little interest, since the paper was published in a rather inconspicuous collection, and since I feel certain that I have read it more carefully than Mr. Brooke, I shall venture to state the nature of the argument in very few words. Mr. Gray's view that the play was written first by Shakespeare and revised by other dramatists he supports by considerations which may be conveniently reduced to these five:

1. The external evidence in favor of Shakespeare's authorship of the tragedy is weighty.
2. The subject and treatment of the tragedy are not impossible for Shakespeare, as a number of critics have urged.
3. The main portion of the tragedy may be in Shakespeare's language and verse, as opposed to Robertson's claim for specific proof of the language and meter of other dramatists.
4. The passages most likely to be viewed as non-Shakespearean are of such a dramatic character as to suggest that they are additions rather than parts of the original composition.
5. It is *a priori* more likely that the work of a young dramatist